

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
[amandas@potterhandy.com](mailto:amandas@potterhandy.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Golden State Restaurants, Inc.,** a  
California Corporation

Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of: Americans With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Golden State Restaurants, Inc., a California Corporation; and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Golden State Restaurants, Inc. owned Pedro's located at or about 316 N Santa Cruz Ave, Los Gatos, California, in June 2021.

3. Defendant Golden State Restaurants, Inc. owns Pedro's ("Restaurant")

1 located at or about 316 N Santa Cruz Ave, Los Gatos, California, currently.

2 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
3 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
4 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
5 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is  
7 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
8 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
9 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants  
10 are ascertained.

11  
12 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

13 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
14 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
15 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

16 6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
17 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
18 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
19 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

20 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
21 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
22 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

23  
24 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

25 8. Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in June 2021 (four times) with the  
26 intention to avail himself of its goods or services motivated in part to  
27 determine if the defendants comply with the disability access laws.

28 9. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public

1 accommodation, and a business establishment.

2 10. Unfortunately, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
3 to provide wheelchair accessible outside dining surfaces in conformance with  
4 the ADA Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

5 11. The Restaurant provides dining surfaces to its customers but fails to  
6 provide any wheelchair accessible outside dining surfaces.

7 12. One problem that plaintiff encountered was the lack of sufficient knee  
8 or toe clearance under the outside dining surfaces for wheelchair users. While  
9 there was one table that looked potentially accessible to plaintiff, that table  
10 was in the street. Plaintiff had to navigate a curb to gain access to that table.  
11 Meanwhile, the tables that plaintiff did have access to, located on the  
12 sidewalk, were not accessible because of toe and knee clearance issues.

13 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the dining surfaces that  
14 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
15 dining surfaces for wheelchair users.

16 14. On information and belief, the defendants currently fail to provide  
17 wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

18 15. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff  
19 personally encountered these barriers.

20 16. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
21 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
22 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

23 17. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
24 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

25 18. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
26 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
27 disabilities.

28 19. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much

1 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
2 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
3 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
4 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
5 access if complete removal were not achievable.

6 20. Plaintiff will return to the Restaurant to avail himself of its goods or  
7 services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is  
8 represented to him that the Restaurant and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff  
9 is currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing  
10 barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the  
11 site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and  
12 discriminatory barriers again.

13 21. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
14 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
15 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
16 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
17 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
18 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
19 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
20 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
21 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

22  
23 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**  
24 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all  
25 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

26 22. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
27 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
28 complaint.

1       23. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
2 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any  
3 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone  
4 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.  
5 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 6           a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
7 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
8 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
9 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the  
10 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those  
11 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 12           b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
13 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are  
14 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 15           c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the  
16 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
17 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,  
18 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the  
19 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
20 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
21 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
22 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

23       24. When a business provides dining surfaces, it must provide accessible  
24 dining surfaces.

25       25. Here, accessible dining surfaces have not been provided in  
26 conformance with the ADA Standards.

27       26. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
28 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the

1 1991 Standards.

2 27. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
3 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
4 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

5 28. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
6 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

7  
8 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
9 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
10 Code § 51-53.)

11 29. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
12 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
13 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
14 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
15 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
16 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
17 Civ. Code § 51(b).

18 30. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
19 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

20 31. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
21 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s  
22 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
23 privileges, or services offered.

24 32. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
25 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
26 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
27 (c).)

28 33. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing

1 discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting  
2 physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical  
3 personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

4  
5 **PRAYER:**

6 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
7 relief as follows:

8 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
9 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
10 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
11 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

12 2. For equitable nominal damages for violation of the ADA. See  
13 *Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*, --- U.S. ---, 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021)  
14 and any other equitable relief the Court sees fit to grant.

15 3. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
16 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

17 4. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
18 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

19  
20 Dated: August 6, 2021

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

21  
22  
23 By: 

24 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
25 Attorney for plaintiff  
26  
27  
28